

25 March 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Organization and Methods Service

FROM: Deputy Chief, Organization and Methods Service

1. You have asked that I furnish to you information relative to the apparent duplication among the various CIA testing, assessment and evaluation programs. The observations made herein arise from my contact with these activities during the past year and are made without benefit of a current factual survey.

2. The testing function as done by the Personnel Office is limited to clerical and stenographic testing, and since this function is not duplicated elsewhere in the Agency little duplication exists in this field.

3. At the present time, there is an Assessment and Evaluation Division, headed up by [REDACTED], within Covert Training and a Testing and Evaluation Division, headed up by [REDACTED], within Overt Training. Initially there existed within the old OSO/OPC Training Division, headed up at that time by [REDACTED], an assessment and evaluation activity under [REDACTED]. The assessment and evaluation activity, as well as the OSO/OPC Training Division, existed primarily for the purpose of teaching OSO and OPC employees the fundamentals of clandestine collection and operations. A thorough two to three-day assessment followed by validation represented the assessment goal at that time. The assessment activity operated as a service and received its workload in accordance with the wishes of the operating Offices. There was, therefore, little uniformity among the Office programs as well as an absence of assessment on the overt side of CIA. Assessments for OPC were made prior to employment of all Grade-12 and above candidates. In addition, since many employees were on duty before the program was launched, assessments were required for all candidates for promotion to Grade-12 vacancies and above in OPC. OSO assessments were done on an ad hoc basis for people going into certain key or sensitive spots and there were no absolute rules or standards. Thus, it can be seen that the assessment activity was in no position to control its workload or to prescribe standards of uniformity for the Agency.

25X1A9a
25X1A9a
25X1A9a
25X1A9a

Document No. 24
NO CHANGE in Class. X
☐ DECLASSIFIED
Class. CHANGED TO: TS S C
DDA Memo, 4 Apr 77
Auth: DDA REG. 77/1763
Date: 230377 By: 025

-2-

25X1A9a
25X1A9a

4. When the Office of Training was created, [REDACTED] replaced [REDACTED] as Chief of the covert assessment activity, and [REDACTED] 25X1A9a assumed supervision over the newly created overt assessment activity. The overt assessment activity has existed now for several months, but has never become fully and properly staffed and therefore does not possess the capabilities of the Covert Assessment Staff. The functions of the two Assessment Divisions do duplicate each other, and it is believed that this duplication should be eliminated. The result would not be an economy as such, but it certainly should result in a better quality end product and more comprehensive and uniform coverage of CIA.

25X1A9a
25X1A9a

5. You are aware of the existence of Career Development Staffs, and functions in both the Office of Training and the Personnel Office. This duplication stems from the fact that career development as an organizational entity was instituted first in the Office of Training, then later in the Personnel Office. It appears that the work of Mr. [REDACTED] Career Service Committee ([REDACTED] is assigned to Personnel) has progressed to the point where it may be feasible to consider divesting the Office of Training of primary responsibility for career development. They should, of course, retain responsibility for gathering together, shepherding and tutoring the employees of the CIA Intelligence School. It is believed that the responsibility for inaugurating and controlling the CIA Career Development Program should be lodged in the Personnel Office.

6. It seems to me that assessment and evaluation activities are necessary in the CIA program for recruitment, placement and career rotation. If this assumption is valid, it logically follows that the Personnel Office should be charged with the responsibility for assessment and evaluation. One of the things which they might evaluate would be, of course, employee progress under Agency sponsored training programs.

7. Recently you and I discussed with Dr. Teitgen his plans for launching a psychiatry program within the Agency. The launching of this program will offer a fertile opportunity for an inevitable clash between the psychiatrists and psychologists. Each usually contends that the other should work for him. It seems to me that the Central Policy Committee, which Dr. Teitgen recommended as a device for controlling and prescribing CIA psychiatric practices, could very well become a device for controlling and standardizing both psychiatry and psychology practices. Under such an arrangement it would, of course, be necessary to add a psychologist to the Committee representation.

[REDACTED] 25X1A9a